V E T A C

www.doe.virginia.gov/Div/VETAC

VETAC Full Committee Meeting
James Monroe Building
Jefferson Room, 22nd Floor
October 3, 2006
10:00 AM

Minutes

Members Present
John Littlefield, Chair, Regional Study Group II Representative
Bill Flaherty, Vice Chair, Virginia Association of School Business Officials
Jim Carroll, Past Chair, ELT Medium School Division
Chad Sansing, Secretary, Virginia Association of Teachers of English
Ena Wood, ITRT Medium School Representative
Dave Mirra, Regional Study Group III Representative
Sallie Hill, ITRT Small School Representative
Patricia Rudolph, Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers
Pamela Burnette, Regional Study Group VII Representative
Marilyn Walls, Regional Study Group I Representative
David Gangel, Regional Study Group VIII Representative
Inez Farrell, Virginia Community College System
Craig Herndon, State Council of Higher Education in Virginia
Joe Hill, Regional Study Group V Representative
Zahrl Schoeny, Virginia Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
Bill Dotson, Virginia Society for Technology in Education
Elizabeth Riddle, Regional Study Group IV Representative
Robert Stiegler, Business and Industry (N-STAR)
Melissa Warren, Virginia State Reading Association
Adele Morris, ELT Small School Division
Janet Copenhaver (for Sharon Dodson), Regional Study Group VI Representative
Susan Clair, Department of Correctional Education
David Rankin, Virginia Educational Media Association
Sherry Ward, Virginia Council for Private Education
Dot Walton, Virginia Education Association
Virginia Jones, Virginia Middle School Association
Paul Nichols, Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum
Ramesh Kapoor, ELT Large School Division
Larry Crum, Business and Industry
Virginia Woodbury, Virginia School Boards Association

Department of Education Personnel
Richard Schley, Educational Computing: Telecommunications
Tammy McGraw, Director, Educational Technology, VETAC Executive Secretary
Greg Weisiger, Teleproduction, VSEN Coordinator
Bethann Canada, Director, Educational Information Management
Joyce Faye White, Educational Computing: Instruction and Remediation
Mark Saunders, Educational Technology Grants
Linda Holt, Educational Technology Training and Integration
Julie Mersiowsky, Educational Technology Planning
Flora Cosby, Office of Educational Technology

New Member Orientation
Bill Flaherty welcomed new members to VETAC and introduced them to the present Department of
Education directors. The present directors briefed new members about their directorships.

Opening
Welcome and Introduction of New Members
John Littlefield opened the meeting at 10:01 a.m. He welcomed the new members and asked them to
introduce themselves to the group.

Introduction of Current Members
John next asked members to introduce themselves and the organizations they represent.

Approval of May 9th, 2006, minutes
After correcting a homonym error a few typos on page 3, the committee approved the minutes with
corrections as noted. Zahrl Schoeny moved to accept the minutes, and Sherry Ward seconded.

Old Business
VETAC Annual Report
John Littlefield asked the committee to review the report and then invited Jim Carroll to make comments.
Jim pointed out as especially important the topics for the 2006-2007 presentations and work sessions.

New Business
VETAC Calendar for 2006-2007
John Littlefield directed the committee's attention to its meeting calendar. Joyce Faye reminded all full
committee members that they are expected to make two of the three meetings, and to make an effort to
notify the committee before an absence and to arrange for a substitute.

John reviewed the full committee and executive committee meeting dates for the group.

Joyce urged the group to let Flora Cosby know as soon as possible whether or not we can make
announced meetings.

Discuss Topics/Plans for 2006-07
John Littlefield took the committee through a review of slated presentation and work session topics. He
then solicited Zahrl Schoeny to invite Greg Weisiger, Inez Farrell, and Virginia Jones to join Zahrl in
preparing the February work session on connections between higher education and k-12 programs.

Cathy Cheely will present on Virtual Schools in February. Our ITRT members will present on the state
of their organization in May. Dave Mirra and Bob Stiegler will present on N-STAR today. Dave Mirra
and one of his ITRTs will present on Internet Safety and Bullying on a date to be determined. John and

Bill Flaherty will present on fiber networks at a later date, as well. John thinks that the slated presentation on guidelines for network security and safety might be dropped due to time constraints.

Internet Safety
The guidelines ready to be released appreciate the educational value of the Internet and suggest that users at all levels share responsibility in using the Internet safely – students, teachers, parents, and administration, all.

The guidelines come from a wide survey of conferences, programs, and literature on Internet safety.

The guidelines are an extension and enhancement of the division's acceptable use policies. Implementation of the guidelines will therefore be audited as are current implementations of acceptable use policies.

The print version of the guidelines shared by Tammy McGraw should be on-line as a .PDF on Friday, along with a Supt's memo on the guidelines.

The glossy print version will be mailed out as soon as possible. It will be trickier to share a poster of the guidelines' cover, as it's a stock image and rights-managed.

Tammy's personnel have created a draft rubric for measuring successful implementation of the guidelines. Tammy expects that a draft rubric for comment will be sent out within weeks. The guidelines were extensively reviewed internally and externally, and so the rubric's benchmarks should be attainable. Tammy invites VETAC members interested in the guidelines to volunteer in shaping the compliance piece – the rubric and/or its supporting documents – to let her know.

The guidelines will be launched publicly in a joint presentation with Delegate Fraylin and law enforcement officials.

Joyce asks members to remind their affiliated groups that these guidelines are meant to permeate instruction, and not to serve as a one-off Internet safety unit. We should look for opportunities to teach Internet safety whenever possible.

The rubric will include measures of pervasive curricular integration, stakeholder involvement, clear lines of sight for implementation responsibilities, and Internet safety needs-assessments. It's both an instruction and technology piece - integrated.

Deadlines for school compliance are fluid at the moment. Schools will need some time to decide their approaches to meeting the guidelines. The first year of the program will be considered a development year with the rubric serving as a need-assessment tool. After the normal 2-year cycle, the DOE will report on the information it has received from divisions about implementation and compliance.

E-Rate Update
Greg Weisiger reminds the committee that to get E-Rate funds divisions must meet the 1976 CIPA law on Internet safety policy and implementation, which includes a public hearing requirement on policies developed by participating school divisions. The Virginia DOE will make sure that compliance with the state's guidelines meets CIPA, as well, so as not to jeopardize E-Rate funds.

Greg summarizes E-Rate as a federal Congressional program to provide technology infrastructure discounts to divisions based on location and relative poverty. He notes Virginia's success in participating in the program – 98% participate. E-Rate funds are not counted as federal funds – private schools can apply for them. The money from the program goes to contractors and vendors.

Greg reviews his E-Rate program report with the committee. About half of the 2006 fiscal year's requests have been funded thus far.

With Chairman Martin's appointment to the FCC, applicant friendly policies have been out in place to fund as many legitimate requests as possible. Exceptions are cases of obvious waste, fraud, or abuse.

Divisions awarded funds in the 2005 fiscal year need to claim their funds by the end of October, 2006.

Training for prospective applicants will begin this month. Greg reminds committee members to tell their divisions to contact him for E-Rate walkthroughs as the program does not remind applicants to claim their moneys or appeal their denials.

N-STAR Presentation

Dave Mirra introduces Bob Stiegler to the group. Dave hails N-STAR as a wonderful technology integration piece, drawing on real-world problem solving skills and cooperative work skills as much as on technology. Bob shared the program's history with the committee, as well as its complementary programs for high-school and college internships. The two then presented an informational DVD on the N-STAR program. N-Star stands for Naval Research Science and Technology for America's Readiness. It's a partnership between the Naval Surface Warfare Division at Dahlgren Center, Stafford's Middle Schools, and William & Mary's education department - as program evaluator. N-STAR involved 350 7th graders last year. Stafford ITRTs did training with Dahlgren engineers and worked on its curriculum. The project brings students to solve real world problems by building and programming Lego Mindstorm robot to locate and remove "mines" for humanitarian purposes. Oil spill clean-up has featured in subsequent iterations of the program. The purpose of the work is to entice students to pursue studies and careers in mathematics, technology, engineering and science. N-STAR is a push-in program – it involves all students – that by requirement necessitates problem-based learning, meets state SOL, and serves students at all instructional levels in Stafford's 7th grade. Expos and summer camps have given students chances to show off their work and engage in other science and math projects such as velocity problems, egg-drops, rocketry, and alarm design.

A total analysis report is due in 6 months. Bob notes that students have already evidenced changes in the way they communicate and work with one another. Rhode Island and Maryland have expressed interest in the program. Although Senator Warner requested funds to continue the program, the Navy was not awarded federal funding to send out engineers this fiscal year; the schools have their funding, however, for technology purchases, as well as the robotics kits left behind. Rhode Island, Maryland and Virginia are all working to secure funding for next year. External organizations like the Chamber of Commerce have lobbied for the reinstatement of N-STAR funds, though the Navy by law cannot make such requests in this case.

Plans to expand the program into elementary and high schools exist. If the program can become a naval program of record, or a DOD program, with reliable funding, it could expand geographically. However, the program would need to exist independently for 4 years to achieve such designation. Craig Herndon recommends N-STAR present to house education committee 25. Bob says federal agencies cannot attend such committee meetings without an invitation, but he can give information to anyone with access. The DVD is available for public review. Bob shares his contact information with the committee so group members can pursue involvement with the program.

Work Session on Culture of Quality Data

Bethann Canada begins by answering for the committee questions posed to her by John.

What does the state do with data? - Numbers help make policy and funding decisions at the state and federal levels. So quality data is important to the state so it can create sound policy, label divisions

correctly, and get money to its divisions and help divisions and teachers use data to improve teaching in targeted areas exposed by such data.

What will the state do to encourage the keeping of quality data? - The state checks with divisions to try and balance the state's data needs with divisions' reporting capabilities. The state shares data with divisions to help remedy instructional and programmatic weaknesses. The state checks the data for accuracy and lets divisions know how to correct reporting mistakes. The state advocates for divisions based on reported data. The state promotes standards, protocols, and funds for quality data keeping.

From the district perspective, John reports that we collect a phenomenal amount of data from attendance to test results to special education information. Districts compile data from schools and report it to the state. Districts try to provide accuracy checks for individual schools. Districts also try to train data entry folks to use quality data collection protocols and to own the data so it can be understood and used at the building level. District policies aren't always policed, so implementation of quality data collection is a challenge. Districts try to ensure quality data collection and reporting also to support the work of their superintendents and school boards.

Bill says in God we trust; all others bring data. Bill says quality data must be accurate, secure, have utility, and be timely. These characteristics can help data meaningfully impact scheduling, budgeting, and placement, so data entry personnel must receive support in becoming more efficient and accurate. Measures to improve efficiency and accuracy include setting time aside for data entry, funding temporary help to cover office duties so veteran personnel can enter data, and keeping data entry places in quiet areas of the school.

Obstacles to quality data entry include a lack of consistent entry processes or roles/levels of access for data stakeholders, a lack of data entry training, and a lack of understanding data's importance. Data must also be kept secure and be frequently checked to ensure its accuracy.

Bill says a data team composed of personnel with overlapping data roles can help provide principals with trusted data as he or she reports out to the division.

The committee broke into role-playing groups to dramatize the perils and triumphs of data collection by a variety of stakeholders.

Bill points us to this URL - http://scs.k12.va.us/presentation.DataQuality - for the presentation.

Announcements
Educational Technology Leadership Conference
Linda Holt reminds us of the conference dates, location, and theme. She points out sessions on podcasting, technology toys and tools, and open source applications. A special forum on virtual learning will also occur. There will also be JMU-sponsored sessions on P-21 skills, and a strand on Internet safety. Microsoft, too, will facilitate 3 sessions on its school leader program. The annual award luncheon will also occur during the conference.

Information about the conference is linked from the technology section of the DOE website.

Next VETAC Meeting
John asks for any other items to be shared.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m. with Bill Flaherty made motion and Dave Mirra seconded.